

Serial No.: 09/985,780

Docket No.: 122.1474

**AMENDMENTS TO THE DRAWINGS:**

The drawings are amended as described below by presenting replacement figures as attached hereto.

FIGS. 14A – 14C are amended.

### **REMARKS**

In accordance with the foregoing, the specification has been amended to correct typographical errors and to clarify terminology, with no introduction of new matter. Further, corrected Figures 14A-14C are supplied with additional labels, consistent with the description in the specification (as amended in the paragraph beginning at page 16, line 31, above); to facilitate understanding of the Figures. Further, certain of the claims have been cancelled and others have been amended, as later explained in detail. No new matter is presented.

In the foregoing amended claims 3, 7, 15 and 19, a term "predetermined value" has been introduced, which has a basis of support in the specification. As described at page 4, lines 7-35, particularly, lines 17-35 in the specification, a rest period always exists when the apparatus is manufactured for 60Hz but is used at 50Hz. The rest period in the frame has a length more than a certain value ( $1/50 - 1/60 = 3.33\text{ms}$ ), which is determined from the difference between 50Hz and 60Hz. When the apparatus is manufactured for 60Hz and it is used at 60Hz, there can be a case in which no rest period exists. Further, the length of the rest period is increased according to a total number of sustain pulses in each frame.

Therefore, the rest period in the frame has a length more than a predetermined value; for example, the predetermined value is the certain value (3.33ms) when the apparatus is manufactured for 60Hz and it is used at 50Hz, and the predetermined value is zero when the apparatus is manufactured for 60Hz and it is used at 60Hz. This predetermined value corresponds to the "predetermined value" used in the amended claims 3, 7, 15 and 19.

Accordingly, approval and entry of the corrected figures and the specification and claim amendments are respectfully requested.

### **STATUS OF CLAIMS**

Claims 2, 5, 6, 10, 11, 14, 17, 18, 22 and 23 are allowed.

Claims 1, 3, 7, 9, 12, 13, 15, 19, 21 and 24-26 are rejected.

Claims 4, 8, 16, 20 and 27 are objected to.

In accordance with the foregoing, claims 1, 9, 13, 20, 21 and 25-27 are cancelled and, further, claims 8 and 20 were previously cancelled.

Accordingly, claims 2-7, 10-12, 14-19 and 22-24 remain pending herein and reconsideration of same is respectfully requested.

**ITEM 9: ALLOWED CLAIMS**

In Item 9, claims 2, 5-6, 10-11, 14, 17-18 and 22-23 are allowed.

In Item 10, claims 4, 8, 16, 20 and 27 are objected to but indicated to be allowable if suitably rewritten into independent form.

Claim 3 has been amended to depend from allowed claim 2 and, thus, claims 3/2 and 4/3 are submitted to be allowable.

Claim 15, while rejected in the prior Action, is now amended to depend from claim 14 which is indicated to be allowable and, thus, claim 15/14 as well as its dependent claim 16/15 (the latter also indicated to include patentable subject matter, in Item 10 of the Action) are allowable along with the independent claim 14.

Claim 17, 18/17, 22 and 23/22 are allowed in Item 9 of the Action.

**ITEM 5: REJECTION OF CLAIMS 1, 13, 25 AND 26 FOR ANTICIPATION BY SHIGETA (USP 6,369,782)**

These claims have been cancelled in the foregoing and thus the rejection is moot.

**ITEM 6: REJECTION OF CLAIMS 12 AND 24 FOR ANTICIPATION BY SHIGETA**

The rejection is respectfully traversed.

Claims 12 and 24 recite a feature that plural arrangement orders of plural subfields in a frame are memorized in accordance with types of images to be displayed, and display is performed with an arrangement order selected from the plural arrangement orders according to judged types of the images. As described on page 20, lines 10 - 17, for example, a frame structure shown in Fig. 9 is used when a still image is displayed and a frame structure shown in Fig. 4 is used when a non-still image is displayed. The arrangement order of the frame structure shown in Fig. 9 is clearly different from that of the frame structure shown in Fig. 4.

The Examiner states incorrectly that Figs. 4 and 5 of Shigeta teach plural arrangement orders of the plural subfields. To the contrary, Figs. 4 and 5 of Shigeta show only one arrangement order of plural subfields. Figs. 4 and 5 of Shigeta show how to represent gradation levels in the frame having the arrangement order of plural subfields. Accordingly, Shigeta does not disclose the plural arrangement orders of plural subfields in a frame. Further, Shigeta does not disclose or refer to the judgment of image types.

.Serial No.: 09/985,780

Docket No.: 122.1474

If there are any additional fees associated with filing of this Amendment, please charge the same to our Deposit Account No. 19-3935.

Respectfully submitted,

STAAS & HALSEY LLP

Date: Sept 12, 2005

By: H. J. Staas  
H. J. Staas  
Registration No. 22,010

1201 New York Ave, N.W., Suite 700  
Washington, D.C. 20005  
Telephone: (202) 434-1500  
Facsimile: (202) 434-1501

**CERTIFICATE UNDER 37 CFR 1.8(a)**

I hereby certify that this correspondence is being deposited with the United States Postal Service as first class mail in an envelope addressed to: Commissioner for Patents, PO Box 1450, Alexandria, VA 22313-1450 on September 12, 2005  
STAAS & HALSEY  
By: [Signature]  
Date: Sept 12/05